

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF VERMONT

Misty Blanchette Porter, M.D.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 2:17-cv-194

Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center,
Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic,
Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital, and
Dartmouth-Hitchcock Health,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney Fees (Doc. 300), including attached Declarations (Docs. 300-1 and 300-2), does not include certain information necessary for the Court to calculate the lodestar in this case. The Motion states the number of hours billed by each attorney and paralegal at Langrock Sperry & Wool, and the respective billing rates (*see* Doc. 300 at 4–5). However, with respect to work performed by Vitt & Nunan attorneys and paralegals, the submissions only provide information for work done “[f]rom 2024 through trial and preparation of th[e] Motion [for Attorney Fees]” (*id.* at 4).

Plaintiff has not provided the following critical information in the Motion (and attached Declarations), Reply (Doc. 318), or Supplemental Memorandum (Doc. 326): (1) the number of hours billed by Attorney Vitt before 2024 (at the rate of \$320/hour); (2) the number of hours billed by Attorney Nunan before 2024, and the applicable rate; (3) the number of hours billed by paralegal Nunan (at the rate of \$80/hour); (4) the number of hours billed by other non-attorney legal staff at Vitt & Nunan (at rates of \$50–\$100/hour); and (5) the number of hours billed by

Attorney Kramer at each of her two different billing rates. These numbers may be calculated based on a review of the billing records submitted to the Court (*see* Doc. 300-3 at 1–261; Doc. 300-4 at 1–8; Doc. 300-5 at 1–53), but it is not for the Court to calculate the number of hours billed, at different rates, by at least seven different timekeepers, as documented in over three hundred pages of billing records.

Plaintiff is ordered to submit the specific numbers listed above to the Court by **Friday July 11, 2025**, in a second supplemental memorandum in support of the Motion for Attorney Fees. The Court requires *the total number of hours billed by each individual timekeeper, specifying the timekeeper's respective hourly rate at the time the services were rendered*. Without this information, the Court is unable to adjust the calculations based on hourly billing rates or number of hours billed, to the extent the Court determines any such adjustments may be warranted. It may be most efficient for this information to be submitted to the Court in a chart. The chart below specifies the information currently lacking in Plaintiff's submissions:

Timekeeper	Hourly Rate	Hours Billed	Total
Attorney Geoffrey Vitt	\$320 (2017–2023) \$400 (2024–2025)	[unknown] 1,120.9	\$? \$448,360
Attorney Sarah Nunan	\$? (2019?–2023) \$260 (2024–2025)	[unknown] 760.8	\$? \$197,808
Attorney Sarah Merlo	\$230 (2017) \$325 (2024–2025)	[unknown] 281	\$? \$91,325
Attorney Katie Kramer: solo and at DGW Kramer, LLP at DTO Law	\$175 (2018–2020) \$450 (2024)	33.4 [+?] 20.4	\$5,845 [+?] \$9,180
Attorney Eric Jones	\$375 (2024) \$395 (2025)	36.10 358	\$13,537.50 \$141,410
Attorney Alison Bell	\$415	9.6	\$3,984
Attorney Bridget Grace	\$225	2	\$450

Attorney Wendy Radcliff	\$250	.25	\$62.50
Paralegal Sherri Lehouiller	\$155	38.3	\$5,936.50
Paralegal Sarah Nunan	\$80	[unknown]	\$?
Other legal staff (Julia Korkus, Katie/Katherine Fenton, Shannon Edson, Christine Lyon, Marianne McCann)	\$50–\$130	[unknown]	\$?
TOTAL			\$917,898.50 + \$?

Dated at Burlington, in the District of Vermont, this 7th day of July 2025.

/s/ Kevin J. Doyle
United States Magistrate Judge